

From gjones@tenet.edu Wed Nov 01 02:54:40 1995
Received: from Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (gjones@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu [198.213.2.9]) by sys1.tapr.org (8.7.1/8.7.1) with SMTP id CAA26987; Wed, 1 Nov 1995 02:54:33 -0600
Received: (from gjones@localhost) by Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id CAA10311; Wed, 1 Nov 1995 02:54:29 -0600
From: Greg Jones <gjones@tenet.edu>
Message-Id: <199511010854.CAA10311@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu>
Subject: TAPR's NEW Virtual Meeting Page
To: tapr-bb@tapr.org (TAPR-BB mailing), tapr-sys@tapr.org (TAPR SYS), regional_freq@tapr.org (Dan Puckett), 0003241437@mcimail.com (Bill Pasternak), bstrick@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (Bob Stricklin N5BRG), mcdermot@eagle.aud.alcatel.com (Tom McDermott), karn@servo.qualcomm.com (Phil Karn), danp@comp.uark.edu (Dan Puckett), tapr-board@tapr.org (TAPR Board), psr@tapr.org (PSR), dsp-93@tapr.org (DSP-93 Build)
Date: Wed, 1 Nov 1995 02:54:29 -0600 (CST)
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL23]
Content-Type: text

TAPR is proud to announce the creation of a virtual meeting, workshop, and seminar page on the www.tapr.org pages.

On our new pages, TAPR uses the RealAudio system to make presentations available for a few events that many amateurs were not able to attend. TAPR is evaluating the RealAudio system, and its current implementation on the TAPR server is limited. The system only allows 6 concurrent connections, so if you find that an audio channel is busy -- try back at another time.

Please let us know what you think about this -- we really want to hear about your experience with these pages.

Currently, the virtual meeting pages include:

*** 1995 TAPR Annual Meeting, St Louis, MO.

Couldn't attend the TAPR meeting in March of 1995 ? Well - here is your opportunity to listen in to both the Sunday workshops. The TAPR/AMSAT DSP-93 Workshop by Bob Stricklin, N5BRG, and Tom McDermott, N5EG as well as a seminar on Error Control Coding by Phil Karn, KA9Q are made available. Using the Adobe Acrobat format (pdf) we have provided the overheads and between the audio and the overheads you should be able to get a lot from the workshop you couldn't attend!

*** Repeater Frequency Coordinators Meeting, Oct 7th, 1995

Hear the entire meeting of the nations repeater frequency coordinators who met with the ARRL and the FCC in St. Charles, Missouri, October 7th, 1995. Hear what was said by Rod Stafford, President of the ARRL and Ralph Haller,

N4RH, Deputy Chief of the FCC's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau. Listen in on the eventual discussions, debates, and eventual outcomes. Read what Newsline published regarding the event.

*** Ham Radio and More Show, August 13th, 1995

Hear the August 13th guest, Greg Jones, WD5IVD, President of TAPR discuss digital issues and what TAPR is doing.

Tucson Amateur Packet Radio
8987-309 E Tanque Verde Rd #337 * Tucson, Az * 85749-9399 * 817-383-0000

e-mail: TAPR@TAPR.ORG ftp: ftp.tapr.org web: http://www.tapr.org

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Thu Nov 02 13:12:50 1995
Received: from dub-img-4.compuserve.com (dub-img-4.compuserve.com [198.4.9.4]) by
sys1.tapr.org (8.7.1/8.7.1) with SMTP id NAA02764 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>;
Thu, 2 Nov 1995 13:12:44 -0600
Received: by dub-img-4.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id OAA26604; Thu, 2 Nov 1995 14:12:38 -0500
Date: 02 Nov 95 14:09:09 EST
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
To: Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>
Cc: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>
Subject: Re: Packet Coordination vs. Repeater Coordination
Message-ID: <951102190909_73303.3537_FHM54-1@CompuServe.COM>

Dan Puckett asked that I repost the following article to the Digital Coordinator remailer. I have already sent it to the Repeater Coordinator remailer.

I was unable to attend the BOM due to schedule conflicts, however I recently wrote a RAIN Dial-Up editorial that was rebroadcast over a large number of repeaters in which I covered the similarities and differences in packet coordination vs. repeater coordination, but I'll try to summarize again here in the remailer.

Repeater & packet frequency coordination is not only similar, but critical in both cases. In fact packet coordination is in many cases more complicated than repeater coordination. In the case of LAN frequencies multiple BBSes can share a common LAN frequencies making them more spectrum efficient than a voice repeater which has historically required a dedicated frequency pair. In the case of packet backbone forwarding channels they require dedicated frequencies and the same degree of careful coordination that a voice repeater does.

There are those that say that you can't coordinate packet because every TNC can be a node or anyone can setup a BBS at home. However since many dual band rigs can cross-band repeat they are in essence repeaters. Not only that, but I know of a number of people who operate short range repeaters from their houses. In spite of this, we still coordinate repeater frequencies for obvious reasons and for the same reason we need to coordinate packet frequencies. Packet BBSes are typically run from home because of significant amount of daily maintenance required and because they're located at home doesn't make them any less reliable or significant.

In many areas packet frequency coordination was left up to the local packet club. It would be like leaving repeater frequency coordination in the hands of a single repeater club. Conflicts of interest are inevitable. In the Chicago area we founded in 1986 a packet frequency coordination organization independent from the packet radio club. Early on we worked closely with the state repeater coordinator to allocate frequencies to digital packet usage. This coordination is critical for true spectrum management to be achieved.

I have also suggested in another RAIN Dial-Up editorial that we need to become more spectrum efficient in how we allocate repeater frequencies. For example, many areas are decoordinating unused repeater pairs. That's a good start, however, many repeater pairs are allocated to individuals who have low profile, short range and in many cases virtually unused repeaters. These pairs are given the same geographic protection as high use repeaters. I suggest we take a cue from commercial services and begin allocating short range, low use repeaters to share common frequencies and develop mechanisms such as use of different PLs to allow these repeaters to share a frequency. This would require a shift in repeater owners thinking from the current belief that they "own" a repeater frequency exclusively into perpetuity once it's been allocated to them. I'd like to see discussion here in the remailer about this.

Quite frankly, I was disappointed that the BOM apparently focused on repeaters and not on spectrum management. With the significant growth in the no-code Technician license there will continue to be a high demand for allocation & utilization of VHF/UHF frequencies. While repeaters are the major allocation of frequencies in the VHF/UHF bands, other modes, like digital require frequency coordination and are allocated significant amounts of frequencies. For example, in NE Illinois packet is allocated 500 KHz or 1/8 of the 2m band. I believe that the sooner we start thinking of spectrum management instead of repeater coordination that we'll begin to address issues like what and how much spectrum is allocated to other modes like packet, ATV, etc.

Perhaps once the SPOC issue is decided we can move on as a group to tackling spectrum management.

73, Mark Thompson, WB9QZB

Founder & Secretary, NIPRFC (Northern Illinois Packet Radio Frequency Council)

From danp@comp.uark.edu Fri Nov 03 09:30:05 1995

Received: from comp.uark.edu (danp@comp.uark.edu [130.184.253.197]) by sys1.tapr.org (8.7.1/8.7.1) with ESMTP id JAA11482 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Fri, 3 Nov 1995 09:30:01 -0600

Received: (from danp@localhost) by comp.uark.edu (8.7.1/8.7.1) id JAA06494; Fri, 3

Nov 1995 09:29:55 -0600 (CST)
Date: Fri, 3 Nov 1995 09:29:54 -0600 (CST)
From: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>
To: regional_freq@tapr.org
Subject: Packet Coordination vs. Repeater Coordination (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951103091848.18545C-100000@comp>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

There has been some discussion of packet coordination on the frequency coordinators remailer. I suppose this helps pass the time as folks wait for the draft of the Memorandum of Understanding that would establish the Single Point of Contact discussed at the Oct 7 meeting in MO <grin>. Anyhow, I thought the message that follows (cross-posted with permission) might be a good starting place for discussion of our own.

BTW, Steve Grantham is SERA Director for the state of Mississippi...

-DanP

----- Forwarded message -----

Gentlemen,

It seems to me that there is a fundamental difference between repeater coordination and packet coordination.

While regional spectrum management and bandplanning have fallen, by default, to the existing regional frequency coordination organizations due to lack of action by the ARRL, and special interest groups, to address matters of significant importance, it seems that the latecomers now want to reinvent the wheel.

New subregional packet organizations are now popping up across the country with increasing frequency. With the birth of each new organization, comes the desire to have a piece of the pie. If they're not wanting to redefine bandplans, they're wanting to become frequency coordinators themselves.

Having been an active packet BBS sysop, repeater operator, and coordinator, my perspective follows...

Packet Coordinators:

Digital councils and coordinators should be concerned with operational covenants concerning traffic forwarding, planning and implementing networks and systems, and planning installations on predefined digital simplex channels.

Repeater Coordinators:

The repeater coordinators are tasked with managing the paired frequencies as defined in their frequency utilization plans.

These are the basic differences, as I see them, between these coordinator

types.

These points, as presented here, only present a rudimentary outline of the situation. They are meant, only, to stimulate a discussion leading to a common understanding of differences.

Thank you for your attention and participation in the discussion.

73! Steve Grantham, N5DWU

From danp@comp.uark.edu Fri Nov 03 09:35:43 1995
Received: from comp.uark.edu (danp@comp.uark.edu [130.184.253.197]) by
sys1.tapir.org (8.7.1/8.7.1) with ESMTP id JAA11973 for <regional_freq@tapir.org>;
Fri, 3 Nov 1995 09:35:40 -0600
Received: (from danp@localhost) by comp.uark.edu (8.7.1/8.7.1) id JAA09554; Fri, 3
Nov 1995 09:35:35 -0600 (CST)
Date: Fri, 3 Nov 1995 09:35:34 -0600 (CST)
From: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>
To: regional_freq@tapir.org
Subject: Re: Packet Coordination vs. Repeater Coordination (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951103093253.18545D-100000@comp>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

More from the coordinators remailer... this is forwarded with permission
as well, Mark is a member of this listserv.

-DanP

----- Forwarded message -----

I was unable to attend the BOM due to schedule conflicts, however I recently wrote a RAIN Dial-Up editorial that was rebroadcast over a large number of repeaters in which I covered the similarities and differences in packet coordination vs. repeater coordination, but I'll try to summarize again here in the remailer.

Repeater & packet frequency coordination is not only similar, but critical in both cases. In fact packet coordination is in many cases more complicated than repeater coordination. In the case of LAN frequencies multiple BBSes can share a common LAN frequencies making them more spectrum efficient than a voice repeater which has historically required a dedicated frequency pair. In the case of packet backbone forwarding channels they require dedicated frequencies and the same degree of careful coordination that a voice repeater does.

There are those that say that you can't coordinate packet because every TNC can be a node or anyone can setup a BBS at home. However since many dual band rigs can cross-band repeat they are in essence repeaters. Not only that, but I know of a number of people who operate short range repeaters from their houses. In spite of this, we still coordinate repeater frequencies for obvious reasons and for the same reason we need to coordinate packet frequencies. Packet BBSes are typically run from home because of significant amount of daily maintenance required and because they're located at home doesn't make them any less reliable or significant.

In many areas packet frequency coordination was left up to the local packet club. It would be like leaving repeater frequency coordination in the hands of a single repeater club. Conflicts of interest are inevitable. In the Chicago area we founded in 1986 a packet frequency coordination organization independent from the packet radio club. Early on we worked closely with the state repeater coordinator to allocate frequencies to digital packet usage. This coordination is critical for true spectrum management to be achieved.

I have also suggested in another RAIN Dial-Up editorial that we need to become more spectrum efficient in how we allocate repeater frequencies. For example, many areas are decoordinating unused repeater pairs. That's a good start, however, many repeater pairs are allocated to individuals who have low profile, short range and in many cases virtually unused repeaters. These pairs are given the same geographic protection as high use repeaters. I suggest we take a cue from commercial services and begin allocating short range, low use repeaters to share common frequencies and develop mechanisms such as use of different PLs to allow these repeaters to share a frequency. This would require a shift in repeater owners thinking from the current belief that they "own" a repeater frequency exclusively into perpetuity once it's been allocated to them. I'd like to see discussion here in the remailer about this.

Quite frankly, I was disappointed that the BOM apparently focused on repeaters and not on spectrum management. With the significant growth in the no-code Technician license there will continue to be a high demand for allocation & utilization of VHF/UHF frequencies. While repeaters are the major allocation of frequencies in the VHF/UHF bands, other modes, like digital require frequency coordination and are allocated significant amounts of frequencies. For example, in NE Illinois packet is allocated 500 KHz or 1/8 of the 2m band. I believe that the sooner we start thinking of spectrum management instead of repeater coordination that we'll begin to address issues like what and how much spectrum is allocated to other modes like packet, ATV, etc.

Perhaps once the SPOC issue is decided we can move on as a group to tackling spectrum management.

73, Mark Thompson, WB9QZB

Founder & Secretary, NIPRFC (Northern Illinois Packet Radio Frequency Council)

From danp@comp.uark.edu Fri Nov 03 09:39:15 1995

Received: from comp.uark.edu (comp.uark.edu [130.184.253.197]) by sys1.tapir.org (8.7.1/8.7.1) with ESMTP id JAA12080 for <regional_freq@tapir.org>; Fri, 3 Nov 1995 09:39:12 -0600

Received: (from danp@localhost) by comp.uark.edu (8.7.1/8.7.1) id JAA11341; Fri, 3 Nov 1995 09:39:07 -0600 (CST)

Date: Fri, 3 Nov 1995 09:39:06 -0600 (CST)

From: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>

To: regional_freq@tapir.org

Subject: oops!

Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951103093624.18545E-100000@comp>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Re: message from Mark Thompson (WB9QZB)

Sorry for the dupe! Please delete my mistake!!

-DanP

From danp@comp.uark.edu Fri Nov 03 17:52:19 1995
Received: from comp.uark.edu (danp@comp.uark.edu [130.184.253.197]) by
sys1.tapr.org (8.7.1/8.7.1) with ESMTP id RAA32215 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>;
Fri, 3 Nov 1995 17:52:16 -0600
Received: (from danp@localhost) by comp.uark.edu (8.7.1/8.7.1) id RAA11773; Fri, 3
Nov 1995 17:52:12 -0600 (CST)
Date: Fri, 3 Nov 1995 17:52:12 -0600 (CST)
From: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>
To: regional_freq@tapr.org
Subject: Re: Packet Coordination vs. Repeater Coordination (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951103165927.18545K-100000@comp>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

In a reasoned reply to Mark Thompson's message (re-posted here) on the
coordinators remailer, Ken Chilton stated that he would like to see a rules
change (Part 97) as follows:

"...no unattended or automatic use of a frequency without coordination
and in accordance with local bandplans."

My reply to Ken and his further comments follow. Thanks to Ken for his
permission to re-post. Please feel free to comment. Perhaps Mark and Ken
will also comment further - both are subscribed to this list.

-DanP

----- Forwarded message -----

> From danp@comp.uark.edu Fri Nov 3 11:49:22 1995
>
> I cannot believe that the nationwide amateur packet radio network is in
> such a state of disarray as to warrant a rules change that would _mandate_
> coordination for _all_ unattended operation!

It is not important what you believe, only that you believe.
However, the "nationwide amateur packet radio network" notwithstanding,
packet operation in an unattended fashion outside of the coordination
mechanism is a nuisance, impediment, and ultimately disastrous to
non-packet operations as well as to legitimate packet networks. And
not just packet, all unattended operations should be coordinated.

Our 440 band is shared with government and military related operations.
I have already worked very hard on several occasions to prevent a
major upset in our ability to use the 440 band in New England. My only
resource that saved the day was the completeness of my coordination
database by which I solved all of the problems the primary services had
in under 24 hours. If ANY of those offending station were uncoordinated,

we would most likely have lost the band from 438-445. Our coordination methods and records are an example for boasting.

> Amateur packet radio technology is not yet mature. Current commercial
> wireless data techniques (e.g, spread spectrum and other PCS technology)
> have yet to be implemented in our production networks. IMHO, rules
> requiring coordinataion would, at this point in time, present an unnecessary
> impediment to further refinement of amateur digital systems.

Frequency coordination would not hinder new technology development.
If anything, it would help it by providing a place for it in the band
and protect it from other modes.

> Now, bandplanning, that's a different matter... more on that later :-)

Bandplanning (at least for us in NESMC) is part of frequency coordination.

Enforcement of bandplans and requirements on coordination - this is
the Eden of our work. There is one thing stronger than all the armies in
the world; and that is an idea whose time has come.

/ _/_ _/_ _/_ _/_/_/_ _/_ _/_ _/_	Ken Chilton, KA1TIH
//_/_ _/_/_/_ _/_/_/_ _/_/_/_ _/_/_/_	440 MHz Band Coordinator
//_/_ _/_/_/_ _/_/_/_ _/_/_/_ _/_/_/_	NESMC Region
/ _/_ _/_/_/_/_ _/_ _/_ _/_ _/_ _/_	email: chilton@emc.com
/ _/_ _/_ _/_ _/_ _/_ _/_ _/_ _/_	

53 Alan Road

Marlborough, MA 01752-1557

This correspondence is Copyright (c) 1995, Ken Chilton.
All rights are reserved.

From kn4aq.gary@mms.raleigh.nc.us Sun Nov 26 11:55:01 1995
Received: from redstone.interpath.net (uucp@redstone.interpath.net [199.72.1.7])
by sys1.tapr.org (8.7.1/8.7.1) with SMTP id LAA22269 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>;
Sun, 26 Nov 1995 11:54:59 -0600 (CST)
From: kn4aq.gary@mms.raleigh.nc.us
Received: from mms.raleigh.nc.us (uucp@localhost) by redstone.interpath.net
(8.6.12/8.6.14) with UUCP id MAA28382; Sun, 26 Nov 1995 12:54:55 -0500
Received: by mms.raleigh.nc.us
id 0HXX000L Sun, 26 Nov 95 12:46:19
Message-ID: <9511261246.0HXX000@mms.raleigh.nc.us>
Organization: MMS Information Systems - (919)779-6674, TELNET BBS.MMS.NET
X-Mailer: TBBS/TIGER v1.0
Date: Sun, 26 Nov 95 12:46:19
Subject: Band Planning by FCs?
To: COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU, regional_freq@tapr.org

BAND PLANNING BY FREQUENCY COORDINATION GROUPS

The question about 6-meter FM simplex going around brings to mind a broader question:

Should FM/Repeater frequency coordination bodies be doing band planning (also called Spectrum Management)?

I have some thoughts pro and con, and I'm sure you do to...

PRO:

The organization is there, functioning on a regular basis. It's hard to get people involved and motivated, unless their ox is being gored, so the existing structure of the coordination bodies is about all there is.

The participants are knowledgeable, usually beyond the immediate area of FM/repeaters.

CON:

Conflict of interest. The fox is clearly guarding the henhouse.

Case in point:

Early this year, SERA announced a new UHF band plan, basically handing it down to UHF users. The plan went well beyond FM/Repeaters, covering ATV and digital. To the extent that ATV channels overlapped CW/SSB and satellite sub-bands, it affected those areas as well.

The plan was well crafted, and SERA did invite participation through a mention in the Repeater Journal. After thinking about it for a while, I came to believe that SERA is the best place for spectrum management in the southeast. They are inviting participation from other modes.

But it's not an easy sell in the digital community, and I've heard plenty of grumbling from the ATV operators in North Carolina.

I'm specifically interested in comments FROM the ARRL representatives on the remailer, on what the ARRL's place in VHF/UHF spectrum management ought to be.

73,

Gary KN4AQ

VP/FC Packet>East of NC

(((((.....))))))
((Gary Pearce AVID Video Editor KN4AQ))
((Raleigh, NC Franklin Video Ham Radio))
((kn4aq.gary@mms.net))
(((.....)))

From vis_pfg@pip.shsu.edu Sun Nov 26 17:40:18 1995
Received: from pip.shsu.edu (daemon@pip.shsu.edu [192.92.115.10]) by sys1.tapr.org
(8.7.1/8.7.1) with ESMTP id RAA05613 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Sun, 26 Nov
1995 17:40:15 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <199511262340.RAA05613@sys1.tapr.org>
Received: from xdial1-slip26.shsu.edu by pip.shsu.edu with SMTP
(1.37.109.16/16.2) id AA255709317; Sun, 26 Nov 1995 17:41:57 -0600
Comments: Authenticated sender is <vis_pfg@pip.shsu.edu>
From: "Paul Gilbert" <vis_pfg@pip.shsu.edu>
To: COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU, regional_freq@tapr.org,
kn4aq.gary@mms.raleigh.nc.us
Date: Sun, 26 Nov 1995 17:40:28 +0000
Subject: Re: Band Planning by FCs?
Priority: normal
X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.22)

> BAND PLANNING BY FREQUENCY COORDINATION GROUPS
>
> The question about 6-meter FM simplex going around brings to mind a broader
> question:
> -----
>
> Should FM/Repeater frequency coordination bodies be doing band planning
> (also called Spectrum Management)?
>

Then who will do it...surley not the ARRL. Do you really expect a plan
that will work for ALL 50 states and not cause a war?

It HAS TO BE DONE on a state by state or regional basis. What works
in NC may not work in Texas. We have beat this to death earlier in
the year. It has been proven time and time again.

> I have some thoughts pro and con, and I'm sure you do to...

Yup, I sure do, and none con. I really hate to be snippy but, the
digital folks were given a chance to do coordination by the repeater
folks long ago and they passed on it. Most saying that they didn't
see the need in it. WRONG, now the horse is way out of the barn, its
a flick of a finger to be a node or digi or BBS and impossible to
keep track of who's on first base.

At this point, without causing a riot, the only thing to do in
bandplanning digital is to set standards as to where we will not
place repeaters. Same applies to weak signal and sideband and sat.

do

I work those modes too, so I want a place to go do that mode of the hobby with as little interference as possible. I assure all, I do see the big picture. (All that was said to head off the folks that don't think I care about other modes, as I do care, very much so).

>

> PRO:

> The organization is there, functioning on a regular basis. It's hard to
> get people involved and motivated, unless their ox is being gored, so the
> existing structure of the coordination bodies is about all there is.
>

Yup, and in the case of Texas we've been here 30 years and work with the digital folks and ATV folks as much as possible.

> The participants are knowledgeable, usually beyond the immediate area of
> FM/repeaters.

I assure you that in Texas the folks that run the Society would astound you as to what they have done or are doing both in the hobby and the real world. I am sure that also applies to other coordination bodies.

> CON:

> Conflict of interest. The fox is clearly guarding the henhouse.

??????? I am confused??????? WHY is it the fox guarding the hen house??

I have had folks scream at me we need to do more and broader band-planning. To include the other modes. I agree to a point. As I said above there are limits and it is way too late in some cases for certain types of band-planning in certain modes.

As in the original statement...who would do it....I am not turning over my coordination efforts to the ARRL without ALOT of ... ands...if's.... and but's connected. That is what we are writting the white paper for.

>

> Case in point:

> Early this year, SERA announced a new UHF band plan, basically handing it
> down to UHF users. The plan went well beyond FM/Repeaters, covering ATV
> and digital. To the extent that ATV channels overlapped CW/SSB and
> satellite sub-bands, it affected those areas as well.

Yes and we have a plan VERY similiar to SERA's. They used several parts of our 440 bandplan for theirs. We have more linking in Texas and thus more link channels in the 420 area. The digital is similiar and the our ATV is limited to 421.250 and the 426/427 freq.

The two plans are very much alike.... if I remember correctly, my predecessor (sp) shared our plan with SERA when they formed theirs. That is why they are much alike with changes in regional differences,

like the need of 420 link freqs.

To expect interference free operation by ANYONE today is a fairy tale.

> The plan was well crafted, and SERA did invite participation through a
> mention in the Repeater Journal. After thinking about it for a while, I
> came to believe that SERA is the best place for spectrum management in the
> southeast. They are inviting participation from other modes.

And what is SERA???? It is a primarily a repeater coordination body,
a very good one and has been around along time.

>
> But it's not an easy sell in the digital community, and I've heard plenty
> of grumbling from the ATV operators in North Carolina.

Don't get me started on ATV. We are planning our 1.2 band with the ATV
crowd in mind. They will fill lots of room up there.

>
> I'm specifically interested in comments FROM the ARRL representatives on
> the remailer, on what the ARRL's place in VHF/UHF spectrum management ought
> to be.

I know you asked for the ARRL's comments, I hope they give theirs, it
will be interesting, but you are also going to get my opinion of what the
ARRL should be doing in band-planning.....

NOTHING....PERIOD....GET OUT OF BAND-PLANNING AND LET THE
COORDINATORS DO IT.

If you haven't noticed this is a REAL big hot button for me.

Thanks for listening, hope you understand, you may not agree, but hope
you understand.

Flames accepted.....

Paul, ZW

Paul Gilbert, KE5ZW
Huntsville, Texas
409-291-9532

The Texas VHF-FM Society
The Amateur Radio Repeater Coordinating
Agency for the Empire of Texas

Coordinating over 1500 Repeaters in Texas for the past 30 Years

From SGranth@aol.com Mon Nov 27 22:28:56 1995

Received: from emout05.mail.aol.com (emout05.mail.aol.com [198.81.10.37]) by
sys1.tapir.org (8.7.1/8.7.1) with SMTP id WAA02446 for <regional_freq@tapir.org>;
Mon, 27 Nov 1995 22:28:52 -0600 (CST)

From: SGranth@aol.com

Received: by emout05.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id XAA12134; Mon, 27 Nov 1995
23:27:46 -0500

Date: Mon, 27 Nov 1995 23:27:46 -0500

Message-ID: <951127232742_36181351@emout05.mail.aol.com>

To: vis_pfg@pip.shsu.edu, COORDINATOR@cs.tamu.edu, regional_freq@tapr.org,
kn4aq.gary@mms.raleigh.nc.us

cc: SGranth@aol.com

Subject: Re: Band Planning by FCs?

In a message dated 95-11-26 18:42:28 EST, vis_pfg@pip.shsu.edu (Paul Gilbert) writes:

>As in the original statement...who would do it....I am not turning
>over my coordination efforts to the ARRL without ALOT of ...
>ands...if's.... and but's connected. That is what we are writting the
>white paper for.

>

>

Paul,

Hmmm... I was just wondering...

What's this 'WE' stuff you're talking about here? (hi hi!)

I thought you didn't make the cut at tryouts... Don't we have just five
players on the court, or is the whistle about to be blown?

73!

Steve Grantham

dribble... dribble... dribble...